

TC1739 REISEN

Organization Bldg./Room

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA. 22313-1450

If Undeliverable Return In Ten Days


Official Business

Penalty For Private Use, \$300

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER



02 14 \$ 00.390  
0004205065 APP 20 2006  
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 22314




NIXIE 122 1 00 04/25/06

RETURN TO SENDER  
NOT DELIVERABLE AS ADDRESSED  
UNABLE TO FORWARD

EC: 22313145050 \*0417-04618-20-43

12301+000A-0A23001450





# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*IFW*

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,955	07/07/2003	Slawomir Rubinsztajn	130129	6777

7590 04/20/2006

General Electric Company  
CRD Patent Docket Rm 4A59  
Bldg. K-1  
P.O. Box 8  
Schenectady, NY 12301



EXAMINER

FEELY, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1712

DATE MAILED: 04/20/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Notice of Abandonment**

Application No.

10/613,955

Examiner

Michael J. Feely

Applicant(s)

RUBINSZTAJN ET AL.


Art Unit

1712

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

This application is abandoned in view of:

1. ☒ Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on 16 September 2005.
  - (a) ☐ A reply was received on \_\_\_\_\_ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated \_\_\_\_\_), which is after the expiration of the period for reply (including a total extension of time of \_\_\_\_\_ month(s)) which expired on \_\_\_\_\_.
  - (b) ☐ A proposed reply was received on \_\_\_\_\_, but it does not constitute a proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection.  
(A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection consists only of: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114).
  - (c) ☐ A reply was received on \_\_\_\_\_ but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below).
  - (d) ☒ No reply has been received.
2. ☐ Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, within the statutory period of three months from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
  - (a) ☐ The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was received on \_\_\_\_\_ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated \_\_\_\_\_), which is after the expiration of the statutory period for payment of the issue fee (and publication fee) set in the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
  - (b) ☐ The submitted fee of \$\_\_\_\_\_ is insufficient. A balance of \$\_\_\_\_\_ is due.  
The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$\_\_\_\_\_. The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$\_\_\_\_\_.
  - (c) ☐ The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received.
3. ☐ Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required by, and within the three-month period set in, the Notice of Allowability (PTO-37).
  - (a) ☐ Proposed corrected drawings were received on \_\_\_\_\_ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated \_\_\_\_\_), which is after the expiration of the period for reply.
  - (b) ☐ No corrected drawings have been received.
4. ☐ The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the attorney or agent of record, the assignee of the entire interest, or all of the applicants.
5. ☐ The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.
6. ☐ The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference rendered on \_\_\_\_\_ and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims.
7. ☐ The reason(s) below:



Michael J. Feely  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit: 1712

Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to minimize any negative effects on patent term.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/613,955	RUBINSZTAJN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Michael J. Feely	1712	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

 (1) Michael J. Feely.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Scott A. McCollister (Reg. No. 33,961).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 13 April 2006
**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**  
 n/a

**Claims discussed:**  
 n/a


**Prior art documents discussed:**  
 n/a

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**  
 See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

A call was placed to Mr. McCollister in February to inform him that the address information in the case was no longer valid. There was no official "change of address" on file, and the post office returned the final office action to the patent office due to the insufficient address. A follow-up call was placed on April 13, 2006, informing Mr. McCollister that no "change of address" had yet been filed, and that the case was now abandoned.